HARDWARE DEVICE FOR PROCESSING THE TASKS OF AN ALGORITHM IN PARALLEL

Technical field

The invention relates to processing of algorithms used in the search engines of a large data communication network such as the Internet, and relates more particularly to hardware devices for processing the tasks of any algorithm in parallel.

Background

The World Wide Web (WWW) provides accesses to a large body of information. Compared with traditional databases, Web information is dynamic and structured with hyperlinks. Also, it can be represented in different forms and is globally shared over multiple sites and platforms. Hence, querying over the WWW is significantly different from querying data from traditional databases, e.g. relational databases, which are structured, centralized and static. Traditional data bases can cope with a small number of information sources; but it is ineffective for thousands.

Most Web documents are text-oriented. Most relevant information is usually embedded in the text and can not be explicitly or easily specified in a user query. To facilitate Web searching, many search engines and similar programs have been developed. Most of these programs are database based meaning that the system maintains a database, a user searches the web by specifying a set of keywords and formulating a query to the database. Web search aids are variously referred to as catalogs, directories, indexes, search engines, or Web databases.

A search engine is a Web site on the Internet which someone may use to find desired Web pages and sites. A search engine will generally return the results of a search ranked by relevancy.

A competent Web search engine must include the fundamental search facilities that Internet users are familiar with, which include Boolean logic, phrase searching, truncation, and limiting facilities (e.g. limit by field). Most of the services try more or less to index the full-text of the original documents, which allows the user to find quite specialized information. Most services use best match retrieval systems, some use a Boolean system only.

Web search engines execute algorithms having internal processes which are repetitive tasks with independent entry data. A classical step by step processing of all processes and decisions on one entry data before processing the next entry data is inefficient since it takes too much time to process all the data. Thus, it is common to perform a search of a pattern within each file of a disk. The main repetitive processes to perform are : load file, open file, scan each word and compare for matching with a pattern, append the result in a temporary file, close file.

One way to improve the performance, and in particular to improve the search response time, is to achieve parallel processing by parallelizing the search mechanism in the database or index table. Such software parallelization will be more optimized but is nevertheless limited insofar as the software processing, even if parallelized, requires a minimum of time which cannot be reduced.

Summary of the invention

Accordingly, the object of the invention is to provide a hardware assist device able to run a set of repetitive processes using local pipelining for each task, and maintaining a relationship between the parent task and the child task for each occurrence in the pipeline.

Another object of the invention is to provide a hardware device for processing the tasks of a search algorithm in parallel wherein each specific task of the search is made by a dedicated processor.

The invention relates therefore to a hardware device for processing the tasks of an algorithm of the type comprising a number of processes the execution of some of which depend on binary decisions, the device comprising a plurality of task units which are each associated with a task defined as being either one process or one decision or one process together with the following decision, and a task interconnection logic block connected to each task unit for communicating actions from a source task unit to a destination task unit, each task unit including a processor for processing the steps of the associated task when the received action requests such a processing and a status manager for handling the actions coming from other task units and building the actions to be sent to other task units

Brief description of the drawings

The above and other objects, features and advantages of the invention will be better understood by reading the following more particular description of the invention in conjunction with the accompanying drawings wherein :

Fig. 1 represents an exemplary algorithm composed of three processes and three decisions.

Fig. 2 represents the algorithm illustrated in Fig. 1 which has been structured into several tasks to be executed by the hardware device according to the invention.

Fig. 3 is a block-diagram representing the hardware device according to the invention.

Fig. 4 is a representation of the configuration register used to control each task executed by the hardware device of Fig. 3.

Fig. 5A and 5B are tables representing respectively the actions to be executed by each task of the algorithm illustrated in Fig. 1 in function of the possible activation sources for an instance and the following instance.

Fig. 6 is a block-diagram representing the connection between the task interconnection logic block of the hardware device of Fig. 3 and the different tasks of the algorithm.

Detailed description of the invention

The exemplary algorithm illustrated in Fig.1 includes three processes P_1, P_2 and P_3 and two decisions D_1 and D_2. Depending on each decision, different functions corresponding to the different paths in the algorithm may be run. The first function is represented by the algorithm flow when decision D_1 is "yes", that is when processes P_1 and P_2 are to be executed. The second function is represented by the algorithm flow when decision D_1 is "no" and decision D_2 is "yes", that is when processes P_1 and P_3 are to be executed. Finally, the third function is represented by the algorithm flow when decision D_1 is "no" and decision D_2 is also "no", that is when only process P_1 is to be executed. In the latter case, the algorithm flow loops back to the entry point and the same functions may be executed again. Thus, during the first algorithm flow, process P_1 is started while the execution of process P_1 is started again when decision D_2 is "no". The second execution of P_1 starts only after the first execution of P_1 has been completed and decision D_1 and D_2 have been completed. Therefore, there is no overlap possible in a simple step by step processing of the algorithm.

Though the algorithm represented in Fig. 1 is very simple, all the algorithms are classically run in the same way.All the events (processes or decisions) of the algorithm flow have to be executed step by step although they are run repetitively with new entry data. The proposed invention allows the various processes and decisions to run separately in order to speed up the processing of the algorithm especially when there is no prior data required on some steps. The main idea to achieve this is to have one processor assigned to a task including a process, a decision or a combination of processes and decisions which will run all the repetitive instances of this task and will be linked to the execution result of the other task processors using a more detailed link information that the simple conventional

link enabling the downstream tasks to be activated.

Using the principles of the invention, the algorithm of Fig. 1 can be divided into tasks as illustrated in Fig. 2. Four tasks are thus implemented.

Task 1 (T_1) includes process P_2 (no decision)

Task 2 (T_2) includes process P_3 (no decision)

Task 3 (T_3) includes the sequential combination of process P_1 and decision D_1

Task 4 (T_4) includes only decision D_2 (no process)

According to the invention, each task is repetitively performed by one processor allocated to this task. Therefore, four processors will be required to run the example algorithm of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

The hardware device according to the invention illustrated in Fig. 3 comprises as many task units 10, 12, 14 as the number of tasks included in the algorithm ($Task_1$, $Task_2$ .... $Task_n$). The interconnection between the tasks is performed by the intermediary of a Task interconnection logic block 16 as explained hereafter.

Each task unit like task unit 10 includes a processor 18 in charge of processing the sequential steps of the process, the decision or the combination of the process and the decision generally incorporated in the corresponding task. Actions received from other task units or sent to other task units by means of Task interconnection logic block 16 are managed by status manager 20 which is preferably a state machine. Status manager 20 is connected to processor 18 by two lines, an input line to processor 18

for starting (S) the task execution and the output line from the processor which is activated when the task is completed (C).

Status manager 20 has essentially two functions (input and output). The input function handles incoming commands from other tasks and the output function builds commands to be sent to other tasks. To perform these functions in conjunction with processor 18, several control/data registers 22, 24, 26 are used. Each control/data register corresponds, for this task, to an instance of the algorithm flow. The number of instances which can be run at the same time depends upon the pipeline capability of processor 18. Generally, it is necessary to have three control/data registers corresponding to instances m, m+1, m+2.

Each control/data register 22, 24 or 26 contains a control field and a data field. The control field is composed of three bits controlled by processor 18, a validation bit V, a completion bit C and a bit L/R indicating whether the output is Left of Right when the task includes a decision.

The data field of a control/data register contains data which are loaded by status manager 20 after receiving an action to be performed from another task and before starting the task execution by sending the start command to task processor 18. These data may be used by processor 18. When the latter has completed the task execution, it may replace the data contained in the control/data register by other data. This data will then be sent to the destination task in the command word and used as an input field by the destination task processor. However, it must be noted that, in case of independent tasks, the data are not modified in the control/data register.

When the task execution has been completed by processor 18, this one sets to 1 the bit C of the control field of the control/data register and a signal C may be sent to status manager 20. Therefore,

either status manager is activated by the input signal C from task processor 18, or there is a polling or an interrupt mechanism which enables the status manager to be informed of the setting of bit C to 1.

The commands which may be received from another task by status manager 20 are START, KILL or VALID. As already mentioned, the START command is used to activate task processor 18. The KILL command means that a task is no longer of interest since the taken decision is opposite to this task. Thus, a task which is the left path of a decision may be killed if the decision is to take the right path. When it receives a KILL command, status manager 20 clears the control/data register corresponding to the instance being considered as each command has as a parameter the instance value called level. Conversely to the KILL command, the VALID command confirms that the considered task corresponds to the taken decision. In such a case, the bit V of the corresponding control/data register is set to 1 by status manager 20.

The output function of status manager 20 is to build commands based on the contents of two configuration registers, CONFIG.L 28 and CONFIG.R 30 and also on the contents of the involved control/data register. The contents of CONFIG.L register which is selected when bit L/R set to 1 are given in Fig. 4. Note that the CONFIG.R register which is selected when bit L/R is set to 0 has exactly the same structure as CONFIG.L register. Note that the CONFIG.L and CONFIG.R registers are loaded at the beginning of algorithm processing and remain unchanged insofar as they contain data fields depending only on the algorithm structure.

As illustrated in Fig. 4, CONFIG.L register contains a first block C selected when bit C is set to 1 and a second block V selected when bit V is set to 1. Each block C or V is used for two actions. For each action the register contains the three following fields wherein X = C or V and n = 1 or 2.

Task Xn indicates which task should be activated

Axn indicates which action is to be performed. For example 00 = kill, 01 = start, 10 = valid and 11 = valid + start.

Lxn indicates the level of task (the instance) corresponding to Task Xn. For example, 00 = current level - 1, 01 = current level, 10 = current level + 1, 11 = current level + 2.

The example of the algorithm illustrated in Fig. 2 will be considered below. In Figure 2 there are four tasks T_1, T_2, T_3 and T_4 which can be executed, but there are six activation sources since Task 3 and Task 4 each have two outputs. Furthermore, a task acting as a source task can activate a destination task in the same level or in the following level. Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B represent tables wherein the activation sources are associated with the columns whereas the tasks to be activated are associated with the rows. Fig. 5A corresponds to the activation of the tasks in a same level whereas Fig. 5B corresponds to the activation of the tasks in level m+1 by activation sources in level m. It should be noted that since only two levels are represented, this means that there is no relationship between the processes of the algorithm on more than two consecutive levels.

In the tables illustrated in Fig. 5A and 5B, only the cases corresponding to an action from an activation source to a task are filled with a letter. Letter S means Start, V means Validate and K means Kill. It must be noted that it is possible that a same source has an action on two tasks. Thus, T_3R kills Task 1, and starts and validates Task T_4.

As already mentioned, status manager 20 (Fig. 2) uses the control bits which have been previously

loaded in CONFIG.L and CONFIG.R registers associated with the task. Thus, if we consider Task3 which generates two activation sources, the CONFIG.L and CONFIG.R registers have the following contents :

CONFIG.L

1. Block C

Action 1 Task C_1 = Task 3

AC_1 = start

LC_1 = current level + 1

Action 2 none

Block V

Action 1 Task V_1 = Task 1

AV_1 = valid

LV_1 = current level

Action 2 none

CONFIG.R

1. Block C

Action 1 Task C_1 = Task 3

AC_1 = start

LC_1 = current level + 1

Action 2 none

2. Block V

Action 1 Task V_1 = Task 1

AV_1 = kill

LV_1 = current level

Action 2 Task V_2 = Task 4

AV_2 = valid + start

LV_2 = current level

The Task interconnection logic block 16 is represented in Fig. 6. Each task such as Task1, Task2, Task3, ... Task n is an input to Task interconnection logic block 16 but is also an output to this block. Each input action or command could be of the same type as each one of the output actions such as KILL, START or VALID. Using the CONFIG.L and CONFIG.R registers where an action is represented by three control fields Task Xn, Axn and Lxn, an action word may use this control fields in addition to the corresponding data (see Fig.4) to transmit the action to the destination task.

In the preferred embodiment illustrated in Fig. 6, the action word containing the control bits of CONFIG.L or CONFIG.R registers and data is input to a three-state driver 40, 42, 44 or 46 where the Task Xn field is decoded in order to select on which bus this action word should be put. This word,

or the remaining bits insofar as the Task Xn field is no longer used, are then decoded by the appropriate task to perform the requesting action.

As illustrated in Fig. 6, there are as many buses as the number of tasks. These buses are three-state so that all inactive inputs have no influence in the bus value. Only the valid one forced by the corresponding driver takes the bus for its command. The width of the bus depends on the size of the action word. In the preferred embodiment the bus size is equal to word size. If there is a problem in the size of the bus, it is well known how to split the word into several blocks appended when sent on a smaller bus. The only drawback of this split will be an increased transmission latency as it will need several clock times to transmit a command or action from one output task to an input task. At least, the TaskXn should be available in the first block of the split word to be decoded correctly.

Each task can then put all the actions on the various buses. As long as there is no capability to have an action simultaneously put on the same bus by two tasks, there is no arbitration required. This is the case for most of the algorithms. Otherwise, an arbitration mechanism may be added on the control of each three-state driver to identify two simultaneous requests for the same destination. A very simple contention mechanism will for example give the priority on the destination bus to the lower source task.